

AFSAR
DEVELOPERS

August 28, 2025

Ref: BOT 25-01; 1308 -1330 S. Meyers Road

To: Village Manager Scott Niehaus

Honorable Village President Anthony Puccio and Respected Trustees Brian LaVaque (District 1), Jessica Hammersmith (District 2), Bernie Dudek (District 3), Patrick Egan (District 4), Dan Militello (District 5) and Bob Bachner (District 6)

Cc: Village Clerk Ranya Elkhatab, Director of Community Development Trevor Dick, Planning and Zoning Manager Anna Papke

Below are the responses to the key questions raised during the August 21, 2025 Village Board meeting.

1. Clarification on Open Space Variance

It is important to note that when the 22-unit development was approved, Community Development Director Bill Heniff testified that the cause of the open space variance was the neighbors' desire that we not place driveways on existing streets, and our willingness to work with them to internalize the drive. That fact has not changed under the 11-unit plan.

Indeed, placement of even 8 homes with driveways on School and Meyers would reduce impervious surface by more than the area that accounts for the shortfall in open space. Thus, the open space variation arises solely from the internal drive design choice, not from the size of homes or site layout inefficiency. If it were not for the efforts with the neighbors, the development would exceed the open space requirement and the access between School Street and Meyers Road would return—resulting in a rejection of two key concessions to nearby owners.

As the developer, we remain committed to collaborating with neighbors for the best overall outcome. However, as is traditional in planned development review, a clear line must be drawn when cooperation would require the loss of functional space or parking. That is the case here: further reductions would impair the viability of the homes.

2. Detailed Open Space Analysis and Alternative Options Evaluated

Below is the detailed open space analysis requested during the board meeting (verified by counsel and our engineer). Alternative options were evaluated between March and July but found to be impractical, unsafe, prohibited, or with no meaningful effect. The Excel version of this table from Mark Daniel is attached.

OPEN SPACE ANALYSIS RE: 10% COVERAGE VARIATION


AREA	170401				
REQ'D OPEN SPACE	85200.5				
LOT	AREA	OPEN SPACE	%	REQD	NOTES
A	39258	15433	39.31%	19629	INTERIOR DRIVE
1	14161	7757	54.78%	7080.5	
2	11470	5066	44.17%	5735	
3	12987	6482	49.91%	6493.5	
4	11623	5342	45.96%	5811.5	
5	11080	4811	43.42%	5540	
6	11081	4812	43.43%	5540.5	
7	11032	4764	43.18%	5516	
8	12618	6178	48.96%	6309	
9	11441	5172	45.21%	5720.5	
10	11441	5096	44.54%	5720.5	
11	12209	5743	47.04%	6104.5	
OVERALL	170401	76656	44.99%	85200.5	
		VARIANCE		8544.5	
		VARIATION AVG PER LOT		776.7727	

CONSIDERATIONS	EST AREA	NOTES
Reduce rear interior of homes (impracticable)	8250	Elimination of functional room
Reduce garage (impracticable)	8159.25	Elimination of parking
Reduce living interior side (impracticable)	8213.04	Elimination of rooms
Create a tapered driveway (deemed unsafe)	1000	Backing at 90 degrees
Place utility shed under grass (impractical)	100	Maintenance, vaulted, access
Adjust interior lot lines, keep yard relief (no net)	0	Affects only lot calculation
Reduce width of County driveway (impossible)	600	County will not allow
Eliminate sidewalk on one side (mobility concern)	1940	Eliminated north sidewalk
Convert concrete washout (not recommended)	225	Civil design
Dedicate SE corner (not needed)	150	Civil design
West sidewalk easement (ROW modification)	160	Routing preferred by all
Eliminate rear patios (impractical)	1716	At grade patio behind fence
Flush install front walks (impractical)	440	Reduces foundation views
Shift Meyers entry sidewalk (impossible)	210	County will not allow
Flatten garage face (impractical)	267.344	Architecturally bad idea
Reduce post west end of north drive (impractical)	624	Access, loses poss. parking
Use permeable pavers (no effect per regulation)	0	Pavers are "impervious"
Eliminate School gate and sidewalk (impractical)	695	Mobility, neighborhood
Narrow streets by 2' (impractical)	1080	Routing preferred by all
Driveways on School/Meyers (neighbors rejected)	10508.86	Eliminate N-S interior access

Driveways on School or Meyers would recover the 5%, impose exit on School for north homes.

The open space variation arises from flipping the street to the interior, without it we have over 52%.

Note that the 44.99% is based on evolving permit drawing consideration, will be at least 45%



AFSAR
DEVELOPERS

3. Internal changes implemented to ensure Open Space variance request does not change

We conducted multiple internal revisions to reduce the home footprint.

- The original plan (consolidating 4 of 22 lots) featured 79-foot-wide homes (February 16 layout).
- Through March 20 and March 26 iterations (78'-10" and 77'-6" respectively), we progressively reduced this dimension.
- The current plan now features 75-foot-wide homes, maximizing efficient layouts while respecting open space goals.





Figure 1: February 16 Plan – 79 ft Width



AFSAR
DEVELOPERS





Figure 2: March 20 Plan – 78 ft 10 in Width



**AFSAR
DEVELOPERS**




Figure 3: March 26 Plan – 77 ft 6 in Width





Figure 4: Current Plan – 75 ft Width



AFSAR
DEVELOPERS

4. Total Sq. Ft. Comparison

As requested during the hearing, below are comparisons of total square footage of the previous and current homes:

- The prior 22-lot plan included homes averaging roughly 7,160 sq ft each (6,618 + 538 garage).
- The current 11-lot plan features larger homes averaging 12,000 (10,722 + 1,254 garage) sq ft each—halving density while preserving open space and improving building separation.

The Pinnacle at Meyers	SQFT
Rooftop	1365
Upper Floor Plan	2130
Main Floor Plan	1592
Basement Plan	1531
Total Liveable Sq. Ft.	6618
Two Car Garage	538
Rooftop Open Deck Area Rear	353
Rooftop Covered Deck Area Rear	200
Rooftop Covered Deck Area Front	125






Figure 5: 22 Lot Plan – 7,100 sq ft Average



AFSAR
DEVELOPERS



Figure 8: Detention Pit with Gravel Base – June 7, 2025




AFSAR
DEVELOPERS



Figure 7: Detention Pipe Installation – June 10, 2025



Figure 9: Aerial Drone View – June 19, 2025



AFSAR
DEVELOPERS

6. Gates

We hope that the Village now understands that Pinnacle remains a networked community. Neighbors will interact with one another, see each other on the new sidewalks and in nearby parks. Access will not be prevented by any gating plans at Pinnacle. The driveway gates have been explained at length. Pinnacle cannot abandon the gate planning which features two sidewalk gates from 14th Street, opposing east and west gates bookending an interior sidewalk, and a vehicular access system that is intended to deter unintended use or cut-through traffic on a privately maintained street to be operated by an association of owners.


7. Closing Statement

We appreciate the Board's and the community's thoughtful input. Through deliberate plan reductions and infrastructure enhancements, we have demonstrated good-faith responsiveness to concerns about open space, density, and environmental stewardship. Importantly, the **current 11-lot plan requires fewer variations and deviations than the previously approved 22-lot design**, while also providing larger homes, more open space per lot, and improved separation between buildings.

We respectfully request your approval of this revised development plan, which balances growth with thoughtful design and responsible land use.

Sincerely,

Ahmed Irfan Khan
Founder & CEO
Afsar Developers LLC



AFSAR
DEVELOPERS

Addendum – Footprint Comparison

There was a request for information concerning the footprint. The 22-home development had a per lot footprint of 2,130 SF and an overall footprint of 46,860 SF. The previous area of each home was 7,140 SF, with a total home area of 157,080 SF. The 11-home development has a per lot footprint of 4,701 SF and an overall footprint of 51,711 SF. The current area of each home is 11,883 SF, with a total home area of 130,713 SF.

The design of the home was responsive to a handful of concerns raised by neighbors. First, the garage occupies approximately 1,254 SF of the ground floor to accommodate more parking. Second, neighbors complained that lack of recreation areas would force people to rooftops, so each home can add a modest swimming pool or fitness area, which occupies 736 SF. As a result, over 48% of the ground floor is comprised of the garage area and fitness and pool area.

The third issue addressed in the home design is the rooftop floor. Residents were concerned with rooftop floor use. Under the current design, the rooftop floor is centered on one-third of each home. The rooftop usable area fell by 67%. This led to a relocation of the area to the interior, including the fitness and living room areas. Afsar hopes that the Village understands that the footprint cannot be considered in isolation. Each floor connects with other floors through use and access such as exterior or interior stairs. Additionally, stacking of service connections within each home is affected. Alterations to the footprint spread below and above the ground floor. Additionally, there is no feasible means through which Afsar will be able to comply with the 50% open space rule due to the private road. (If there were no private road, the storm facilities could be declared via an easement rather than an outlot.) Eliminating 10.75 feet to 12.75 feet from the right, left or rear extensions of the footprint is not possible.

Although one might wonder if Afsar can negotiate in terms of percentages, for example adding 1% of development area, or adding 1,704 SF for each percentage point above 45% desired, this is 155 feet per lot. On the rear face, there is a reduction of the building by two feet. This is a gross impact of as much as 465 SF per residence. Eliminating 2.7 feet of the depth of the home would lead to 155 SF, but one must consider when negotiating for each percent that the effective gain is along the house, behind a fence and amid landscaping. Afsar cannot replan the homes to adjust the walls.

At hearing, our attorney noted that open space was disconnected from drainage. It is an aesthetic concern even though it does contribute to drainage planning. For example, there is no credit for a percentage of the area of permeable pavers in a development. In this instance, gaining 1% open space along the walls of the homes does not create a beneficial visible benefit for the neighbors or among the homes in the development. Even if Afsar reduced the depth by one foot, which it cannot, the next gain is 638 SF or .3% of overall open space. Again, this is an impractical solution because there is no benefit to anyone inside or outside the development.